



CLARK COUNTY

RFP #804

ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS SYSTEM PROJECT MANAGER

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

UPDATED: JULY 21, 2021

	QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	I saw the recent posting of RFP #804. As I look at the details, I see there is a plan list as one of the attachments. What is this list for? If my company, Healthcare Triangle Inc., is not listed are we still eligible to submit?	If you have received this email directly from Clark County, then you are already on the plan holders list. If this email was forwarded to you, then you received this RFP from another source and you will need to complete Attachment B and email it to Koni.Odell@clark.wa.gov and Priscilla.Ricci@clark.wa.gov
2.	I have a question regarding RFP #804 Section IB #6 Prevailing Wage (if applicable). It states: As of July 1, 2019, it is required that contractors meet the new requirements for Prevailing Wage and public works requirements, per RCW 39.04.350. Bidder shall be either exempt, by having a valid Washington business license for three years or more and completed three or more public works projects or received and completed training on prevailing wage and public works requirements. Does this mean the organization submitting the bid needs to have a business licensed in Washington, and if not the second part says the contractor needs to complete training on prevailing wage. Could you tell me what is required for that?	This RFP is not a Public Works project nor is it expected to involve any of the job classifications listed at https://lni.wa.gov/licensing-permits/public-works-projects/scopes-of-work . Therefore, this requirement is not applicable for this RFP and resulting contract.
3.	I have listed a few questions below, but I would like to know if you have 15 minutes to spare for a conversation with our knowledge experts regarding the RFP.	Per page 12, Section IIA of the RFP, there will be no pre-submittal meeting or site visit scheduled for this project. In order to ensure all bidders receive the same information and to avoid unfair advantages, questions and requests for clarification regarding this Request for Proposal must be directed in writing, via email, to the person listed on the cover page.
4.	Are you able to disclose the systems that you will be implementing? • What will be used for the EMR?	The system(s) have not been selected yet. The system RFP will be released in late August - September.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will be used for the billing? 	
5.	Will implementation of the billing system be a part of this RFP?	Yes.
6.	Will the resources need to be local?	No.
7.	Will the resources be able to work remote?	Yes.
8.	How many facilities or locations will be included in the implementation?	Three.
9.	Is the project already funded?	Yes.
10.	What programs will be using the EMR since Insight currently serves 6 programs?	The same six programs will use the new EMR.
11.	Will you be implementing the EMR for all six programs? If so, which would you like to roll-out first?	Yes. All programs must roll out simultaneously.
12.	For the liability insurance, is it necessary to have cyber liability, or will professional liability suffice?	It has been determined that cyber insurance is not required. Professional liability insurance as listed in the RFP is required. An amendment to the RFP will be posted reflecting the change in insurance requirements.
13.	The timeline outlined on pg12, sec IIA, specifies that questions are due by July 28, answers to be provided July 29, and hard copy proposals to be delivered by August 4. As one day must be built in for proposal printing and one day for delivery of the hard copy required, this leaves only one single business day to produce a proposal responsive to the answers provided on 29 July. As hardcopy submittals are required, would the County consider extending the deadline a minimum of a full calendar week, to allow respondents enough time to properly integrate the County's Q&A responses into our bids?	An updated Q&A form will be posted periodically at https://clark.wa.gov/internal-services/requests-proposals and the last update will be posted on July 29th. In alignment with the project timeline, the RFP deadline is August 4 th .
14.	Has an EMR vendor and solution already been selected, or is your expectation that this consultant will facilitate that process?	The system(s) have not been selected yet. The system RFP will be released in late August - September. The project manager is not expected to facilitate the selection process.
15.	Does the county intend to purchase a "COTS" (Commercial-Off-The-Shelf) "Out-Of-The-Box" solution or develop a custom application? If the County intends to implement a custom developed solution, who is responsible for that development, and work is the intended role of the EMR PM this RFP seeks?	Clark County Public Health prefers to purchase a COTS system.

16.	What other vendors, 3rd parties, or Clark County SMEs do you envision being involved in this project and coordinated by this consultant?	If needed, Clark County Public Health will consider an implementation partner(s) for system configuration.
17.	Is your expectation that this consultant will coordinate the design, development and testing of the solution, or will that be done by a Project Manager for the vendor supplying the EMR product?	This consultant will be expected to track all phases and tasks in the project plan. Design, development, and testing activities are expected to be done in collaboration with the Clark County Public Health project team and the EMR vendor.
18.	Is there a Business Analyst on the project team to gather requirements, or is your expectation that this consultant will also serve in this role?	Clark County Public Health is currently working with a business analyst to gather functional requirements.
19.	Who is responsible for "Administrator and User training"? Will this be provided by the selected EMR system provider?	This consultant will be expected to track all phases and tasks in the project plan. Training activities and meetings are expected to be done in collaboration with the Clark County Public Health project team and the EMR vendor.
20.	<p>The RFP lists "Provide change management communications and coaching" (p.g5 #16) as a deliverable. Can you please clarify expectations for this part of the scope?</p> <p>Is there already an Organizational Change Management (OCM) resource assigned to this work? If so, what is your expectation around how the Electronic Medical Records System Project Manager would work with this resource?</p> <p>For the introduction of a new IT solution, recommended Organizational Change Management scope would include deliverables such as stakeholder documentation, stakeholder outreach, adoption facilitation, etc. This would typically be beyond the scope and capabilities of an IT PM and would require inclusion of an Organizational Change Management SME on the team. Is the expectation that the selected firm provide an Organizational Change Management SME as well as an Electronic Medical Records System Project Manager, or will OCM be handled by others?</p>	There is no Organizational Change Management resource currently assigned to this work. The expectations for this consultant include tracking change management tasks and collaborating with the Clark County Public Health project team and vendor on change management communications and activities.
21.	Please clarify the meaning of "place of performance" (pg.8 #4). The RFP identifies multiple potential premises but is unclear about who determines the place of performance. Can the consultant opt to work remotely or is there an expectation of some onsite presence? If periodic onsite presence is expected, can you speak to the anticipated frequency required?	There are little to no needs for an onsite presence. Remote work is acceptable.
22.	Please clarify the definition of a "public works project" as intended in the exemption language in pg.9, #6. Does this mean any public sector or government entity project, or do	Please see the response to question #2 above.

	you define a "public works project" as a particular type of project?	
23.	Please clarify your definition of "fully loaded rates" (pg. 15, sec IIIA). Does this include expenses for any necessary travel, such as to your offices in Vancouver? Will travel costs be reimbursed?	Please provide your total costs, including travel, for this project. As noted in the response to question #21, remote work is acceptable.
24.	The Budget/Cost section (pg. 15, sec IIIA, #2) requires an estimate of hours for each of the deliverables in the payment schedule. As a prospective external consultant we are unable to estimate hours for overseeing the design, development and testing of an unspecified solution to be built by an unspecified entity. Can the County can provide an estimated duration for this phase we can use for an estimation of hours for the supplied PM resource?	Acknowledging that a system has yet to be identified, please provide a general, high-level schedule with an implementation date of no later than December 31, 2022.
25.	The deliverables and payment schedule (pg. 8, #3) makes payment contingent on the County's acceptance of specific deliverables. However several of the elements make the selected firm financially liable for delivery of work provided by others and beyond the control of the Electronic Medical Records System Project Manager. For example 25% of the contract being payable on System Configuration, Design and Development, which will presumably be provided by the selected EMR system provider. An external PM would not control the internal allocation of resources of the selected EMR system provider; it is this resource allocation that would determine the length of this project phase. Also by conditioning payment on completion of these phases, the County has set up a contract where the consultant firm providing the Electronic Medical Records System Project Manager might not get paid for many months, with a full quarter of the payment for a two year project being withheld until development is completed by others. A similar scenario is created by the Implementation / Deployment phase, which will presumably be performed by the selected EMR system provider as well. These sorts of payment terms create high barriers to small and minority-owned firms competing for County projects, as they cannot afford to go many months without payment, essentially ask such firms to shoulder the financial risk of the project. Would the County consider instead allowing monthly billing of actual hours worked, with regular reporting matching hours of effort to progress on deliverables, thus making this opportunity more accessible to small, minority and women own firms?	This is the intended payment schedule for this project.

26.	<p>The insurance requirements on pg. 10, sec B, conflate "Professional" and "Cyber Liability" insurances into a single requirement, when these are two very different types of coverage. Further, a requirement for \$5m of coverage is far in excess of the requirements of our other public sector clients, including King County, City of Seattle, and the State of WA, who typically require \$1m or \$2m in Professional / Errors and Omissions coverage for a PM role (versus a capital construction project, for example). Cyber Liability coverage is very different, is not relevant for a Project Management contract (versus your selected provider of the EMR application / platform), and is extremely expensive and difficult to obtain for a consulting firm such as ours that does not do application development or system configuration (quotes we have received in the past would multiple our cost of insurance TEN fold, if we could find someone to write it, which is not easy). Would the County consider lower the required Professional Liability coverage to a more typical \$1m and eliminate the requirement for Cyber liability insurance?</p>	<p>It has been determined that cyber insurance is not required. Professional liability insurance as listed in the RFP is required. An amendment to the RFP will be posted reflecting the change in insurance requirements.</p>
27.	<p>Pg.10, sec D lists "Pollution and Asbestos liability" as a requirement. Can you please clarify why this is included? It appears to be unrelated to the scope of this project and is not a type of liability that a firm such as ours would carry.</p>	<p>This RFP is not a Public Works project nor is it expected to involve pollution or asbestos. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable for this RFP and resulting contract.</p>
28.	<p>Please can you confirm if Exhibit 3, Invoice Example (pg. 27) is simply indicative of the content of the final contract, or if the County would like bidders to submit a sample invoice in our proposals?</p>	<p>This is a sample invoice that is part of the contract's content.</p>
29.	<p>As I read through the RFP, I was wondering if a EMR has been selected? Or is the is part of this RFP vendor selection (i.e. what EMR to to select)?</p>	<p>Please see the response to question #14 above.</p>
30.	<p>May examples of "...documented experience working with at least two public health and/or governmental agencies..." exceed five years?</p>	<p>No. Bids will be evaluated on a bidder's ability to document working with at least two public health and/or governmental agencies within the past five years.</p>
31.	<p>May considerable experience managing technical projects within the health care services industry substitute for experience specific to electronic medical records?</p>	<p>No. Bids will be evaluated on a bidder's ability to document has two or more consulting projects involving successful electronic medical records system implementations within in the past three years.</p>
32.	<p>What EMS is being used today?</p>	<p>Per the Background section on page 4, Clark County Public Health currently uses Insight.</p>

33.	Has the new EMS been selected or will the PM help lead the vendor selection process?	Please see the response to question #14 above.
------------	--	--